

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ILYANA KHANLAROVA,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01115-JHC

ORDER

The Court submits this order to explain the basis for its ruling at Dkt. # 7.

Pro se Plaintiff, Ilyana Khanlarova, brings this action against King County Superior Court, a judge of that court, and an administrator there. Dkt. # 2.

1. The motion fails for lack of notice

Plaintiff requests emergency injunctive relief. *Id.* But she does not provide any indication that she notified Defendants about the motion. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1); LCR 65(b)(1). Nor does she provide a sworn statement to explain that lack of notice should be excused. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1); LCR 65(b)(1). Lack of notice here is an independent ground for denial of the motion.

1 2. The motion does not show a likelihood of success on the merits

2 The legal standards for a preliminary injunction and a TRO are “substantially identical.”
3 *Stuhlbarg Int’l Sales Co v. John D. Brush & Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001). To
4 obtain a TRO, a plaintiff must show that (1) they are “likely to succeed on the merits”; (2) they
5 are “likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of” a TRO; (3) “the balance of equities tips
6 in [their] favor”; and (4) a TRO “is in the public interest.” *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d
7 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008))
8 (called the *Winter* factors). The purpose of a TRO “is to preserve the status quo and prevent
9 irreparable harm[.]” *Jones v. H.S.B.C. (USA)*, 844 F. Supp. 2d 1099, 1100 (S.D. Cal. 2012).

10 The motion does not explain how Plaintiff can bring her claims against the Superior
11 Court, a judge, and an administrator—much less how she is likely to prevail on the merits against
12 them. This is also an independent and separate ground for denial of the motion.

13 3. Conclusion

14 Given the foregoing, the Court denied Plaintiff’s Motion for Emergency Injunctive
15 Relief, Dkt. # 2, and struck as moot Plaintiff’s Motion for Same Day Emergency Oral
16 Argument/Hearing with a Judge, Dkt. # 5.

17 Dated this 31st day of July, 2024.

18
19 

20 John H. Chun
21 United States District Judge